(13)

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1941.

No. 299.

T. E. STEPHENS,

Petitioner,

—against—

RICHMAN & SAMUELS, INC.,

Respondent.

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

MORRIS CUKOR,
Counsel for Respondent,
New York City, New York.

SANFORD SOLARZ,
Of Counsel.

THE COURT PRESS, N. Y. C.

SUBJECT INDEX.

PAGE

I. The Opinions of the Courts Below 1

II. Jurisdiction 1

III. Questions Presented 2

IV. Statute Involved 4

V. Statement of Case 6

Summary of Argument:

POINT I—

A. This Court has no power to review the evidence or the findings of fact made by the lower courts because of the failure of the petitioner to preserve these matters for review 11

B. The findings of the lower courts should not be disturbed by this Court because not only are they not clearly erroneous but they are substantially supported by the evidence.... 13

POINT II—No jurisdiction was acquired over respondent's person since neither the Texas Statute nor the appointment by respondent of a service agent applies to a suit, such as this, brought against respondent, a foreign corporation, after it had ceased doing business in Texas upon causes of action arising outside of that state..... 15

POINT III—No jurisdiction was acquired over respondent's person since neither the Texas Statute nor the appointment by respondent of a service agent applies to a suit, such as this, brought against respondent after it had ceased doing business in Texas upon causes of action which accrued before the enactment of the statute and before respondent obtained a permit to do business and appointed a service agent in Texas..... 21

PAGE

Point IV—Neither the Texas Statute nor the appointment by respondent of a service agent applies to transactions in interstate commerce, and since the transactions in this suit were in interstate commerce, no jurisdiction was acquired over respondent's person..... 26

Point V—The revocation by the respondent of its appointment of a service agent in Texas was effective to defeat service upon him in this suit, although no jurisdiction would have been acquired even if the appointment had not been revoked 30

Point VI—

Answering Petitioner's Arguments 32
Answering Petitioner's Point II 33
Answering Petitioner's Point III 36
Answering Petitioner's Point IV 37
Answering Petitioner's Point V 39
Answering Petitioner's Point VI 40

Point VII—Petitioner has given no reason why this court should grant his petition for a writ of certiorari 42

Conclusion 43

Appendix i

Table of Cases Cited:

Alexander, etc. v. *National, etc.*, 33 Fed. Supp. 334.. 16
Allen v. *Tyson-Jones Buggy Co.*, 91 Tex. 22.....27, 28

Bank of Waterproof v. *F. & D. Co.*, 299 Fed. 478... 11
Butler v. *U. S.*, 108 Fed. (2d) 27.....11, 13
Butler Bros. v. *U. S. Rubber Co.*, 156 Fed. 1 (cert. denied 212 U. S. 577).....27, 28

PAGE

Chipman v. *Jeffrey*, 251 U. S. 373; 64 L. Ed. 314; 40 S. Ct. 172 ..... 15, 19, 30, 32

Continental Supply Co. v. *Hoffman*, 135 Tex. 552; 144 S. W. (2d) 253 ..... 28, 30

Currin v. *Wallace*, 306 U. S. 1 27

Dickson Publishing Co. v. *Bryan*, 5 S. W. (2d) 980 (Texas) 27, 28

Drybrough v. *Ware*, 111 Fed. (2d) 548 11

Fairclough v. *Southern Pacific Co.*, 171 App. Div. 476, Aff'd 219 N. Y. 657 (114 N. E. 1066) 22

Fleischmann v. *U. S.*, 270 U. S. 349 11

Furst & Thomas v. *Brewster, et al.*, 282 U. S. 493 ..... 27, 28

Hartley v. *Utah, etc.*, 106 Fed. (2d) 953 ..... 21, 24

Harvey Co. v. *Mallory*, 288 U. S. 415 11

Hoffer, etc. v. *Brian*, 38 S. W. (2d) 596 ..... 37, 43

Hunter v. *Mutual, etc.*, 218 U. S. 573; 31 S. Ct. 127 ..... 15, 19, 20, 21

Iwata v. *Western Fruit Growers*, 90 Fed. (2d) 575 .. 39

Johnson, Ambrose v. *Richman & Samuels Inc.* (U. S. District Court, Southern District of Texas, Laredo Div., Opinion not published, see Appendix, pp. 1 to 4) 15, 17, 19, 31

Kelly v. *Johnson Nut Co.*, 38 Fed. (2d) 177 42

Kraus v. *American Tobacco Co.*, 283 Pa. 146; 129 Atl. 60 ..... 28, 29

Lasater v. *Purcell Mill*, 22 Tex. Civ. App. 33 27

Louisville, etc. v. *Chatters, etc.*, 49 S. Ct. 329 ..... 37, 38, 43

Massachusetts, etc. v. *Preferred, etc.*, 110 Fed. (2d) 764 11

Meixell v. *American Motor Sales Co.*, 103 N. E. 1071 .. 26

Missouri Pacific, etc. v. *Clarendon Co.*, 257 U. S. 533 .. 15

Mitchell, etc. v. *Selden, etc.*, 257 U. S. 213; 66 L. Ed. 20; 42 S. Ct. 84 ..... 15, 19, 30, 32

Moore v. *National Hotel, etc.*, 21 Fed. Supp. 177 ..... 15, 17

PAGE

Morris & Co. v. *Scandinavia, etc.*, 279 U. S. 405; 73 L. Ed. 762; 40 S. Ct. 360 ..... 15, 30, 32

Morris & Co. v. *Scandinavia, etc.*, 81 Fed. (2d) 346 ..... 15, 16, 19, 20, 30, 32

Morrison v. *B. & O. R. R. Co.*, 117 App. Div. 613 (N. Y.) 22

Neibro Co. v. *Bethlehem Ship Building Corp., Ltd.*, 308 U. S. 165 ..... 34, 43

Old Wayne, etc. v. *McDonough*, 204 U. S. 8; 51 L. Ed. 345; 27 S. Ct. 236 15

Ozark Pipeline Corp. v. *Monier*, 266 U. S. 555 ..... 27, 28

Page v. *Arkansas Gas Co.*, 286 U. S. 269 14

People's, etc. v. *American, etc.*, 246 U. S. 79; 62 L. Ed. 587 16

Pick Manufacturing Co. v. *General Motor Co., et al.*, 299 U. S. 3 ..... 13, 14

Rutland, et al. v. *Wilson*, 108 Fed. (2d) 92 14

Simon v. *Southern Ry. Co.*, 236 U. S. 115; 59 L. Ed. 492; 35 S. Ct. 255 15

Sioux Remedy Co. v. *Cope*, 235 U. S. 197 ..... 27, 28

Stanolind, etc. v. *Christian*, 64 S. W. (2d) 363 ..... 37, 43

Union Bleachery v. *U. S.*, 79 Fed. (2d) 549 ..... 11, 12, 13

Union Pacific R. R. Co. v. *Laramie Stockyard*, 231 U. S. 190 ..... 21, 23

U. S. v. *Commerecial Credit Co. Inc.*, 286 U. S. 63 ... 14

U. S. v. *McKinney*, 107 Fed. (2d) 879 21

U. S. v. *O'Donnell*, 303 U. S. 501 13

Vandenbark v. *Owens, etc.*, 110 Fed. (2d) 310 21

Wefel v. *W. P. Brown, etc.*, 58 Fed. (2d) 667 ... 37, 38, 39

Statutes and Constitution Cited:

PAGE

Judicial Code as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925, 43 Stat. 938:
Sec. 240 (a) 2

Judicial Code, Section 51, 28 U. S. C. A. 112..... 35

Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 7 U. S. C. A., Sec. 499 (b)..... 39

Revised Civil Statutes of Texas:
Article 2031A 4, 23, 24, 29, 30
Article 1995, Sub. 27..... 37

Rules of the United States Supreme Court, Rule 38 (5) 42

12 R. C. L. Sec. 89, p. 113..... 25

Texas Constitution:
Article 1, Sec. 16.....21, 23

Textbooks and Encyclopedias Cited:

Restatement of the Law of Conflict of Laws, Sec. 91, Sub. C 35

45 American Law Reports, p. 1447 at 1454.....22, 25, 26